



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Second Peter, which bears plain traces of the influence of Jude, is a Catholic letter written to strengthen the weakening belief of the church in the Parousia. An indication of its date is found in its giving Paul's Epistles a place among the Sacred Scriptures (3 16). "Here the New Testament canon is in plain sight." Our author says that it is much easier to think of such an assertion being made after than before 150. A probable date for the Epistle is 180.

The commentary is written in a free style, with ample use of explanatory historical material, showing in these respects a marked contrast to Kühl's presentation of the letters in the seventh edition. Instead of detached expository comment we find a connected discourse, into which exposition, illustration, and discussion of interpretations differing from the author's are interwoven in a readable context. Those acquainted with Dr. Knopf's *Nachapostolische Zeitalter*, published in 1905, will be reminded of the ample learning and historical tact displayed in that excellent book. A marked feature of the exposition is the use made of the mystery religions in explaining the religious ideas of the readers of First Peter. Knopf differs from Kühl and most other recent commentators in regarding the "spirits in prison," to whom Christ preached after his death (1 Pet. 3 20), not as disembodied human spirits but as the sons of God of Gen. 6 2; thus finding in the passage a modification of the myth told in Enoch 6-11. In 46 the "dead" to whom a preaching was done are men, "the innumerable shades in the wide dark caverns of Hades." "Here appears the proud consciousness which ancient Christianity had of the universal content and value of the Gospel."

To those New Testament students who accept Dr. Knopf's critical conclusions, First Peter, Second Peter, and Jude will take on new interest and value from the help they give in connecting the Christianity of the second century with that of the Apostolic Age. In putting them to this use the author's comments on the text and especially the illustrative material he has collected will be found enlightening.

EDWARD Y. HINCKS.

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN APOCALYPSES. The Schweich Lectures for 1913. F. C. BURKITT. Oxford University Press. 1914. Pp. viii, 80. 3s.

RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT BETWEEN THE OLD AND THE NEW TESTAMENTS. (The Home University Library of Modern Knowledge.) R. H. CHARLES. Henry Holt & Co. Pp. 256. 50 cents.

Few subjects have so greatly increased in importance for the pursuit of historical theology as the study of that period which in-

tervenes between the Old and the New Testaments. There is therefore likely to be considerable interest raised by Professor Burkitt's and Dr. Charles's recently published books.

Professor Burkitt's book is one of those rare publications which appeals both to the educated but unprofessional public and also to a small group of special students. The former will find that the body of the lectures is one of the most interesting and clearest accounts yet published of the general nature and real importance of Apocalyptic literature. The smaller group of specialists will find much interesting and some controversial matter in the appendices.

In the first of his lectures Professor Burkitt expounds the general meaning and importance of the Apocalyptic Idea, and he does so by the interesting method of contrasting the Rabbinical Judaism of Johanan ben Zakkai, which rejected the Apocalyptic Idea, with Christianity, which accepted it and for a time perpetuated its teaching. In his description of the former he does a justice which has often been denied by Christian scholars to the teaching of Johanan ben Zakkai. "This great Rabbi rejected the notion," says Professor Burkitt, "that the Kingdom of God was an external state of things which was just upon the point of being manifested, and (as a corollary) that the person of insight could know something about it beforehand. . . . He kept a sober mind, like Jeremiah before him. He saw the inevitable destruction of Jerusalem; and so, when the crash came, and the sacrifices came to an end, he was prepared to guide Jewish thought and religion into new channels, not less profound, if necessarily more narrow, than those along which they ran of old. He was content to let the future age wait for God's good time, when it should please him to reveal it; and perhaps it was as well that he could not foresee the future, or he might not have had the courage to begin his epoch-making work in the Vineyard at Jamnia."

This raises exceedingly interesting considerations, and I know of no Christian book which brings out so fully as these lectures the fact that Rabbinical Judaism must be credited with a good deed in having kept alive the national existence of the Jews through eighteen centuries, in which they have had neither land nor temple as a rallying point, but have perpetuated their national existence solely by their loyalty to a code of conduct.

The second lecture deals with the Book of Enoch. Here again Professor Burkitt illustrates his point by a comparison between two opposite points of thought, each of value for the history of Christianity. Just as in the first lecture he contrasted the treat-

ment of the Apocalyptic Idea among Christians with that which it received from the Jews, so he now contrasts the general view of the universe given in Enoch with that made popular in the Greco-Roman world by Posidonius. The comparison is entirely justifiable; Enoch cannot be understood until it be realized that it is really an attempt to give a "philosophy of history." "It is," to quote Professor Burkitt, "an attempt to see the world steadily and see it whole, to unify the physical world, the moral world, and the political world, the world, that is, of the national destiny of God's chosen People. It contains a serious attempt to account for the presence of evil in human history, and this attempt claims our attention because it is in essentials the view presupposed in the Gospels, especially the Synoptic Gospels. It is when you study Matthew, Mark, and Luke against the background of the Book of Enoch, that you see them in their true perspective."

That is admirably stated; but I am not sure that Professor Burkitt deals out equal justice to Enoch and Posidonius. For instance, when he says that "it is fair to say that Posidonius was as truly a formative influence on Pagan culture as Enoch was on Christianity," he seems to imply a contrast between the influence of Posidonius on Pagan culture and that which he exercised on Christianity, which is, I think, unjustified. If we treat Posidonius as a symbol for the general stream of thought (and it is in this way that his name seems generally¹ to be used), his influence on Christianity was in the end probably greater than that of Enoch. Again, he is certainly right in saying that Posidonius fails to explain the existence of evil in the world. But does he quite sufficiently recognize the harm done by Enoch to Christianity in explaining evil by an altogether imaginary and erroneous reconstruction of history? Finally, to continue these carping criticisms, I cannot think that Professor Burkitt is right in denying the creative function of thought. He says, "I am not a philosopher and I do not believe that philosophy, or indeed reflection in general, is really creative. Instinct and conviction, often inarticulate, are creative, and man uses his powers of thought and reflection to justify the actions to which his instincts and convictions have led him." There is, no doubt, an element of truth in these remarks, but on the whole I think that there is more untruth. No doubt, instinct is creative, and inarticulate conviction is possibly sometimes creative; but it is surely an exaggeration to

¹ In much the same way, and with not much more justification, as we use Q to represent a stream of literary activity. People speak more and more of Posidonius and Q as if they were intimately acquainted with their contents, though in actual fact neither is extant at first hand.

deny that thought has created better things than either of these, and cannot be degraded to the rank of being merely their interpreter.

The third lecture deals with the minor Jewish Apocalypses. The limitations of a review forbid any detailed discussion of the many points of interest raised, but I am glad to notice that Professor Burkitt repeats his objections to Dr. Charles's theories as to the text of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

The last lecture deals with early Christian Apocalyptic writing, but in point of fact does not treat very fully this branch of the subject, largely no doubt owing to the limitations of lecturing. Professor Burkitt suggests that a difference may be drawn between the purely Jewish Apocalyptic found in Mark 13 and in cognate literature, the almost purely Pagan Apocalyptic of the Apocalypse of Peter and related documents, and a third type which endeavors to combine the method of Jewish Apocalypse with the desire to set forth the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation. I notice that he does not discuss the *Shepherd of Hermas*. This is undoubtedly an Apocalypse, and it seems to represent a further development of his third class in that it deals with the problems of existing church life as well as with the doctrine of the Incarnation. The most important part of this lecture is the contention that the *Ascension of Isaiah* is a Christian Apocalypse of the third type. Those acquainted with the subject will realize that in thus treating the *Ascension of Isaiah* as an essentially Christian document, Professor Burkitt is differing from many of those who have studied the subject, and his discussion ought certainly be read by all who are interested in early Christian literature. Personally, I think that he makes out a satisfactory case, and that the attempts to dissect the text into a primitive Jewish document with a series of later Christian interpolations are unsatisfactory; but the subject is difficult and will no doubt meet with extended treatment from specialists.

The appendices cannot be reviewed at length. The most important deals with the Greek text of Enoch, and is an elaborate attempt to show that the text of the Gizeh manuscript is preferable to that of the Ethiopic Version and the quotations of Syncellus. This is a point which can scarcely be appreciated properly except by the somewhat limited class of those who are equally at home in Greek, Aramaic, and Ethiopic, and it would be foolish for others to express positive opinions until the controversy is finished. After reading Professor Burkitt, I am inclined to think that he makes out an exceptionally good case, but I imagine that Dr. Charles will have some reply to make.

Dr. Charles's book on the religious development between the Old and the New Testaments, is, like everything he writes, marked by a deep knowledge of the later Jewish literature; but it is impossible to feel that it is a very satisfactory production. In reading his pages I have been unable to escape the feeling that I can understand what he means only because I have already some knowledge of the facts to which he refers, and am constantly irritated by the apparent assumption of pontifical authority in matters which, after all, are not yet settled. The most useful part of the book is the last two chapters, which give a satisfactory account of the literature of the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, an admirably clear statement of Dr. Charles's views on all these books, and in many cases a summary of the opinions of other scholars.

The weakest part of the book, which the general editors of the Home University Library ought surely to have dealt with, is the digression into ecclesiastical politics on pages 169 to 184. There is hardly a word in these paragraphs which has anything at all to do with the subject of the book. They are controversial to a high degree, and the views advocated seem to many entirely mischievous. What, for instance, is to be said of such a paragraph as this: "To the thoughtful students of the past and of the present it is not disestablishment, but re-establishment of national Churches that is now necessary, if the Church and State of the various Christian nations would each achieve their highest"? Similarly, the attack on the Roman Catholic Church on page 177 would justify any purchaser of the book in complaining that he bought it to obtain the views of a scholar on ancient religious history, not of an Orangeman on Roman Catholicism. The sad fact is that as soon as Dr. Charles deserts his own subject, the positiveness of his utterance seems to increase in inverse ratio to the controversial character of his statements. For instance, on page 130 Dr. Charles says, "The doctrine of eternal damnation is a Judaistic survival of a still more grossly immoral character. This doctrine is antagonistic in the highest degree to the Sermon on the Mount, where a man is taught to love his enemies even as God does." One can only feel that although Dr. Charles is a very learned scholar on Jewish Apocalyptic writing, he has yet to learn how to treat the New Testament from a scientific standpoint. It is almost incredible that any one should be able to write such a passage and completely ignore the fact that in the Sermon on the Mount we are told, "Whosoever shall say 'Thou fool,' shall be in danger of the fire of Gehenna" (Mt. 5 22); and,

"If thy right hand cause thee to stumble, cut it off and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish and not that thy whole body go into Gehenna" (Mt. 5 30). I do not believe in eternal punishment in a physical Hell any more than Dr. Charles does, but surely our opinion on this point cannot blot out the fact that we have the Synoptic Gospels against us.

KIRSOPP LAKE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

LIVES OF THE ENGLISH MARTYRS DECLARED BLESSED BY POPE LEO XIII IN 1886 AND 1895. Written by Fathers of the Oratory, of the Secular Clergy, and of the Society of Jesus. Completed and edited by DOM BEDE CAMM, O.S.B. Longmans, Green, & Co. 1914. Vol. I, pp. lxvi, 545; Vol. II, xlii, 691. \$5.00, 2 vols.

When Gregory XIII was Pope, the English College at Rome was adorned with a series of frescoes representing English saints and martyrs before the Reformation, and to these were added pictures of modern martyrs who suffered in the reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth. The papal permission to include these moderns with the ancients was afterwards adjudged to be an informal but sufficient beginning of the long process of their possible canonization. In this process the holy person is first pronounced Venerable, then Blessed, and at last, after much examination of the matter, Saint. By decree of Pope Leo XIII, all of the martyrs whom the artist had depicted in the fresco with the saints were numbered among the Blessed. They were accorded what is technically called Equipollent Beatification. The faithful in England were permitted to honor them with public veneration. Brief biographies of these sixty-three persons appear in these volumes.

Of course, this kind of writing is hagiography rather than history, but within the limits thus prescribed it is admirably done. Records and documents have been carefully searched, and the results are recorded as quietly and dispassionately as the circumstances permit.

The Blessed show more human nature than appears in most of the conventional saints. "'Sirrah,' says the Lord High Treasurer to Thomas Woodhouse, 'was it you that wrote me a letter the other day?' 'Yes, sir,' saith Mr. Woodhouse, approaching as near his nose as he could, and casting up his head to look him in the face, 'that it was, even I, if your name be Cecil'; whereat the Treasurer, staying awhile, said more coldly than before, 'Why, sir, will ye acknowledge me none other name nor title than Mr.